



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

JABBAR STRAWS, §  
§  
Plaintiff, §  
§  
vs. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:06-1929-HFF-TER  
§  
LEXINGTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S §  
DEPARTMENT *et al.*, §  
§  
Defendants. §

---

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND DISMISSING CASE

---

This is a civil rights action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting that the case be dismissed *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. The Report is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or may recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed his Report on September 11, 2006, and Plaintiff failed to file any objections to the Report. In the absence of such objections, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir.1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standards set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of this Court that this case be **DISMISSED** *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. The Court, however, declines to deem the dismissal a strike for purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 4th day of October, 2006, in Spartanburg, South Carolina.

s/ Henry F. Floyd  
HENRY F. FLOYD  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this Order within **thirty (30)** days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.